- 112. Leucorrhinia proxima Calvert. Kennebec: East Pittston. Lincoln: Jefferson, McCurdy Pond, Medomak, Nobleboro, Somerville. 6/12–8/22.
- 113. Pachydiplax longipennis (Burmeister). *Lincoln: Hog Island, 1 Q, 7/6/49 (by Robert L. Birch). This is the second record of this southern species in Maine.
- 119. Erythemis simplicicollis (Say). *Lincoln: Biscay Pond, an adult β seen 8/23/49; Medomak, $1\,$ Q, 7/19/50; New Harbor, an adult β seen 7/19/50; Sherman Lake, $1\,$ Q, 7/16/50. These are the first records of this species in Maine, and represent the most northeastern records of the species.
- 114. Pantala flavescens (Fabricius). LINCOLN: Keene Neck, New Harbor, Round Pond. 7/16–8/27.

LITERATURE CITED

- Borror, D. J. 1944. An annotated list of the Odonata of Maine. Can. Ent., 76: 134-150.
- GIBSON, A. 1913. The entomological record of 1912. 43rd Ann. Rept. Ent. Soc. Ontario, pp. 113–140.
- Wadsworth, M. 1902. Sixth addition to the list of dragonflies (Odonata) of Manchester, Kennebec Co., Maine. Ent. News, 13: 246-247.

Corrections to the Paper on "The Male Genitalia of Syrphus, Epistrophe and Related Genera" (Diptera: Syrphidae).

By C. L. Fluke, University of Wisconsin

Unfortunate circumstances caused a number of errors to appear in the above-named paper published in the Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters Vol. 40: pp. 115–148, August 15, 1950. My purpose in calling attention to these mistakes is primarily to correct a very serious error due to mislabelling of the specimens of two species described by me in 1942 (Revision of the Neotropical Syrphini Related to Syrphus; American Mus. Novitates No. 1201).

The two species referred to are *Epistrophe remigis* Fl. and *Epistrophe altissima* Fl. The identification labels on these two

species became interchanged and the error was not noticed until the paper on the genitalia had been published. The original descriptions are in order and the holotypes are properly labelled to agree with them.

Specimens of *altissima*, labelled *remigis* were sent out to several of my friends and no serious trouble would have resulted except that Dr. Hull (Trans. Zool. Soc. London, Vol. 26: p. 293, 1949) erected a new subgenus, *Metepistrophe*, for *remigis* Fl., but it was evidently based on the specimens so labelled, which were actually *altissima* Fl.

The paper on genitalia carried this new subgenus and added argentipila Fl. to it, but here again it was done on mislabelled specimens of remigis. My interpretation places remigis (correctly labelled) under the genus Episyrphus and places altissima under Metepistrophe.

The errors that have come to my attention at this time are given below:

Page 115, 2nd paragraph, 7th line, read Metasyrphus for Matasyrphus.

Heading of each odd-numbered page 117–147, read genitalia for genetalia.

Page 119, Fig. 19, read invigorus for ivigorus.

Page 121, Figs. 49 and 60, read lasiophthalmus for lasiopthalmus.

Page 124, Fig. 97, read remigis for altissimus. Page 125, Fig. 97, read remigis for altissimus.

Page 126, Figs. 124 and 130, read altissimus for remigis. Page 127, Figs. 124 and 130, read altissimus for remigis.

Page 139, third paragraph, first line, read fourth for third. Page 139, fourth paragraph, first line, read third for fourth.

Page 139, line seven from the bottom, read *remigis* for *altissima*. Page 140, second paragraph, line one, read *altissimus* for *remigis*.

Page 141, fourth line from the bottom, read talus for tylus.

Page 142, second paragraph, enclose venustus Meig. in brackets.

Page 145, line 19, read remigis for altissimus. Page 145, last line, read altissimus for remigis. Page 148, reference 12, add London after Soc.